1 2

3

4

5 6

7

9

8

10 11

13

14

12

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

26

25

27 28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANDREW L. MEEKS, II, Plaintiff, ٧.

ISIDRO BACCA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:18-cv-00431-MMD-WGC

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Andrew L. Meeks, II brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation ("R&R" or "Recommendation") of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 61), recommending the Court grant Plaintiff's motion to voluntarily dismiss his state constitutional claims (ECF No. 58) and accordingly deny Defendants' motions for judgment on the pleadings and to stay this case regarding those state constitutional claims (ECF Nos. 56, 57), primarily as moot. The parties had until September 13, 2021, to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court will accept and adopt the R&R in full.

The Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object to a magistrate judge's recommendation, the Court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) ("De novo review of the magistrate judges' findings and recommendations is required if, but only if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.") (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory

Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court "need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.").

Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is satisfied Judge Cobb did not clearly err. Here, Judge Cobb first explains that Defendants moved for judgment on the pleadings on Plaintiff's Nevada state-law claims, or, alternatively, to stay this case pending the Nevada Supreme Court's resolution of a different case addressing similar state-law claims to those at issue here. (ECF No. 61 at 2-3.) Judge Cobb next notes that Plaintiff responded to these motions in pertinent part by moving to voluntarily dismiss his state-law claims. (Id. at 3.) Judge Cobb then recommends Plaintiff's motion to voluntarily dismiss those claims be granted. (Id.) Accordingly, he recommends that Defendants' pending motions be denied as moot, the motion to stay in full and the motion for judgment on the pleadings in part to the extent it relates to Plaintiff's state-law constitutional claims. (Id. at 3-6.) Judge Cobb further recommends the Court otherwise deny the motion for judgment on the pleadings insofar as it can be interpreted as asserting that the Court does not have jurisdiction over the State and the Nevada Department of Corrections with respect to the state tort claims of assault and battery. (Id.) The Court agrees with Judge Cobb's thorough analysis. Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the Court will adopt the R&R in full.

It is therefore ordered that Judge Cobb's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 61) is accepted and adopted in full.

It is further ordered that Plaintiff's motion to voluntarily dismiss his remaining statelaw constitutional claims (ECF No. 58) is granted.

It is further ordered that Defendants' motion to stay this proceeding while the certified questions to the Nevada Supreme Court are pending (ECF No. 57) is denied as moot.

26 | ///

27 | ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is further ordered that Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings (ECF No. 56) is denied as explained herein and in the R&R.

DATED THIS 17th Day of September 2021.

MIRANDA M. DU

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE